arXiv:math/9901043v2 [math.HO] 16 Jan 1999

THE LACED INTERACTIVE GAMES AND THEIR *A POSTERIORI* ANALYSIS

Denis V. Juriev

ul.Miklukho-Maklaya 20-180, Moscow 117437 Russia
E-mail: denis@juriev.msk.ru

math.OC/9901043 January 10, 1999

The mathematical formalism of interactive games, which extends one of ordinary differential games [1] and is based on the concept of an interactive control, was proposed by the author [2] to take into account the complex composition of controls of a real human person, which are often complicated couplings of his/her cognitive and known controls with the unknown subconscious behavioral reactions of the human organism of this person on them.

A posteriori analysis of the interactive games is of an interest as from the internal point of view as providing a way to unravel the structure of the so-called *intention fields*, one of the main concept of the field-theoretic description of the interactive games [2], which interactions are explicated by the game. To my mind one of the important examples of an intention field is provided by the so-called *"chi"* of the Chineese tradition, intensively explored in Chi Kung or Feng Shui (see e.g. the book [3], where the exposition of the main basic ideas of Chi Kung is presented in the most systematic form). On the other hand an investigation of the structure of intention fields is very important for the elaboration of systems of the accelerated nonverbal cognitive computer and telecommunications based on the using of droems and their dynamical reconstruction [4]. In this case intention fields realise a "virtual dynamical memory", where the droems are really situated. And, at last, the unification of researches in the classical areas of Chi Kung (combined with Feng Shui, which is specially adapted to the design of the interactive virtual realities – the "virtual Feng Shui"), nonverbal cognitive communications and teleæsthesy (especially, in presence of external stimuli) with computer technologies is very perspective for the development of modern information technologies. In all cases mathematical *a posteriori* analysis of interactive games is truly the most effective and simultaneously inexpensive way to understand theoretically the collected experimental data and to make them applicable in practice.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 90D25 (Primary) 90D05, 49N55, 34H05, 93C41, 93B52 (Secondary).

Key words and phrases. Differential interactive games, Interactive control, 2-person games.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}\mathcal{S}$-TEX

This article is devoted to some aspects of *a posteriori* analysis of certain class of interactive games, namely, the laced interactive games, where it may be performed rather effectively. Such analysis allows to give some approximations of the interactive game by ordinary differential games in real time; the obtained series of the approximating ordinary differential games may be used for the formulation of predictions for processes in the considered interactive game.

§1. The laced interactive games

In this paragraph we shall briefly introduce some general concepts of the theory of interactive games.

1.1. The differential interactive games.

Definition 1 [2]. *An interactive system* (with n *interactive controls*) is a control system with n independent controls coupled with unknown or incompletely known feedbacks (the feedbacks, which are called the *behavioral reactions*, as well as their couplings with controls are of a so complicated nature that their can not be described completely). *An interactive game* is a game with interactive controls of each player.

Below we shall consider only deterministic and differential interactive systems. For symplicity we suppose that $n = 2$. In this case the general interactive system may be written in the form:

$$\dot{\varphi} = \Phi(\varphi, u_1, u_2), \tag{1}$$

where φ characterizes the state of the system and u_i are the interactive controls:

$$u_i(t) = u_i(u_i^\circ(t), [\varphi(\tau)]|_{\tau \le t}),$$

i.e. the independent controls $u_i^\circ(t)$ coupled with the feedbacks on $[\varphi(\tau)]|_{\tau \le t}$. One may suppose that the feedbacks are integrodifferential on t in general, but below we shall consider only differential dependence. It means that

$$u_i(t) = u_i(u_i^\circ(t), \varphi(t), \dot{\varphi}(t), \ddot{\varphi}(t), \dots, \varphi^{(n)}(t)).$$

A reduction of the general integrodifferential case to the differential one via an introduction of the intention fields was considered in [2].

1.2. The phase lacing integrals.

Definition 2. Let us consider a differential interactive game with two players, φ is the state of the system, u_i are the interactive controls whereas $u_i^\circ(t)$ are the pure controls ($i = 1, 2$). The magnitude $K = K(\vec{u}(t), \vec{u}^\circ(t), \varphi(t), \dot{\varphi}(t))$ is called the *phase lacing integral* iff it is constant in time for all possible parties of the game. Here $\vec{u}(t) = (u_1(t), u_2(t))$, $\vec{u}^\circ(t) = (u_1^\circ(t), u_2^\circ(t))$.

The definition of the phase lacing integral may be generalized on games with an arbitrary number of players.

Let us consider some special classes of the phase lacing integrals:

- *Configuration lacing integrals:* $K = K(\vec{u}(t), \vec{u}^\circ(t), \varphi(t))$. Such phase lacing integrals will be called simply *lacing integrals*.
- *Dynamical lacing integrals:* $K = K(\vec{u}(t), \varphi(t), \dot{\varphi}(t))$.

Remark 1. The evolution equations of the interactive game supply us by the dynamical lacing integrals $K_i = \dot{\varphi}_i(t) - \Phi_i(\varphi, \vec{u})$, where indices i denote the components of the magnitudes in any coordinate system.

Remark 2. The phase lacing integrals are closed under natural operations (summation, multiplication on any real number or on other phase lacing integrals, functional transformations, etc). The configuration and dynamical lacing integrals possess the same property.

The phase lacing integrals may be considered for any differential interactive system. They are analogs of ordinary integrals for dynamical systems.

1.3. The laced interactive games.

Definition 3. Let us consider a differential interactive game with two players, φ is the state of the system, u_i are the interactive controls whereas $u_i^\circ(t)$ are the pure controls ($i = 1, 2$), each u_i and u_i° has n degrees of freedom. The game is called the *laced interactive game* iff it admits $2n$ functionally independent over $\vec{u}$ phase lacing integrals $K_\alpha(\vec{u}, \vec{u}^\circ, \varphi, \dot{\varphi})$ ($\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, 2n$).

The functional independence of K_α over $\vec{u}$ means that for any fixed values of $\vec{u}^\circ$, φ and $\dot{\varphi}$ the magnitudes K_α are (locally) functionally independent as functions of $\vec{u}$.

Here and below we shall suppose that the phase lacing integrals depend smoothly on their arguments. In this situation the (local) functional independence is equivalent to the inequality of the Jacobian of the mapping $\vec{u} \mapsto (K_1, \dots, K_{2n})$ to zero.

Note that the evolution equations provide us by m dynamical lacing integrals (see remark 1), where m is the number of degrees of freedom of the system, i.e. the number of coordinates, which describe the state φ. If all such dynamical lacing integrals are functionally independent we should look for at least $2n - m$ other phase lacing integrals. Often we are able to choose them from the configuration lacing integrals.

§2. A posteriori analysis of the laced interactive games

2.1. *A posteriori* determination of feedbacks.

A posteriori determination of feedbacks means the expression of $\vec{u}$ via $\vec{u}^\circ$, φ and $\dot{\varphi}$ using the phase lacing integrals K_α. These determination presupposes the knowledge of such *a posteriori* data as $\dot{\varphi}$.

Theorem 1. *Let us consider a laced interactive game, φ is the state of the system, u_i are the interactive controls whereas $u_i^\circ(t)$ are the pure controls of two players ($i = 1, 2$), each u_i and u_i° has n degrees of freedom, $K_1, \dots K_{2n}$ are the phase lacing integrals. In this case the interactive controls u_i may be expressed (locally) via pure controls u_i°, the state φ, its time derivative $\dot{\varphi}$ and the phase lacing integrals K_α as known constants.*

Proof. One should use the fact that the phase lacing integrals are known constants and that the Jacobian of the mapping $\vec{u} \mapsto (K_1, \dots, K_{2n})$ is not equal to zero.

Remark 3. Note that each interactive control u_1 and u_2 is expressed via both u_1° and u_2°.

2.2. Virtual *a posteriori* **decomposition of a collective control.**

The virtual *a posteriori* decomposition of a collective control means such simultaneous transformation of both interactive and pure controls of two players to the controls of the virtual players that *a posteriori* determined feedback of each such player does not contain a dependence on the controls of the other player.

Theorem 2. *Let us consider a laced interactive game, φ is the state of the system, u_i are the interactive controls whereas $u_i^\circ(t)$ are the pure controls of two players ($i = 1, 2$), each u_i and u_i° has n degrees of freedom, $K_1, \dots K_{2n}$ are the phase lacing integrals. Let the interactive controls u_i be expressed (locally) via pure controls u_i°, the state φ, its time derivative $\dot\varphi$ and the phase lacing integrals K_α as known constants:*

$$u_i = u_i(\vec u^\circ, \varphi, \dot\varphi; K_\alpha).$$

Suppose that $\vec u^\circ = 0$ implies that $\vec u = 0$ (i.e. 0 is the stationary point of the mapping $\vec u^\circ \mapsto \vec u$) and also the Jacobi matrix of the mapping $\vec u^\circ \mapsto \vec u$ is nondegenerate and diagonalizable at certain neighbourhood of zero then there exist the functions $\zeta(\vec x; \varphi, \dot\varphi, K_\alpha)$ locally at some neighbourhood of zero so that if we transform both interactive and pure controls $\vec u$ and $\vec u^\circ$ according to them:

$$\begin{aligned}\vec w &= \zeta(\vec u; \varphi, \dot\varphi, K_\alpha)\\ \vec w^\circ &= \zeta(\vec u^\circ; \varphi, \dot\varphi, K_\alpha)\end{aligned}$$

then in new variables $\vec w$ and $\vec w^\circ$ a posteriori determined feedbacks would contain the dependences only between the related components of the controls $\vec w$ and $\vec w^\circ$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}w_1 &= w_1(w_1^\circ, \varphi, \dot\varphi; K_\alpha),\\ w_2 &= w_2(w_2^\circ, \varphi, \dot\varphi; K_\alpha).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The function ζ is constructed explicitely starting from the point $\vec u^\circ = 0$ to provide the claimed conditions on the mapping $\vec w^\circ \mapsto \vec w$.

Remark 4. The controls w_i and w_i° $(i = 1, 2)$ may be interpreted as interactive and pure controls of two virtual players. The transformation of the real players to the virtual players depends on the state φ of the game and *a posteriori* determined its time derivative $\dot\varphi$.

Remark 5 (some psychological interpretations). The virtual *a posteriori* decomposition of a collective control may be regarded as an identification of two virtual players in the area of collective subconscious behavioral reactions. *A posteriori* analysis of the laced interactive games allows to make such procedure on the mathematical level of precision. It is remarkable that such decomposition depends on the state φ and on its time derivative $\dot\varphi$ (hence, on the intensity of the real controls).

§3. The retarded control approximation

A posteriori analysis of the laced interactive games allows to give some approximations of the interactive game by ordinary differential games in real time; the obtained series of the approximating ordinary differential games may be used for the formulation of predictions for processes in the considered interactive game.

3.1. The frozen feedback approximation.

The simplest approximation of a laced interactive game by the ordinary differential games is the frozen feedback approximation. Let us consider the fixed moment t_0 of time and the observed values of $\varphi(t_0)$ and $\dot{\varphi}(t_0)$. Then the knowledge of the phase lacing integrals K_α allows us to express the interactive controls $\vec{u}(t_0)$ via the pure controls $\vec{u}^\circ(t_0)$:

$$\vec{u}(t_0) = \vec{u}(\vec{u}^\circ(t_0), \varphi(t_0), \dot{\varphi}(t_0); K_\alpha).$$

This *a posteriori* determined feedback may be frozen and substituted into the evolution equations:

$$\dot{\varphi}(t) = \Phi(\varphi(t), \vec{u}(\vec{u}^\circ(t), \varphi(t_0), \dot{\varphi}(t_0); K_\alpha)).$$

Thus we obtain an ordinary differential game, which is just the *frozen feedback approximation* of the initial laced interactive game.

3.2. The retarded control approximation.

The retarded control approximation of a laced interactive game is constructed in the following manner. Let us consider an arbitrary $\Delta t > 0$. For any moment of time t the knowledge of the phase lacing integrals K_α allows us to perform *a posteriori* determination of feedbacks, i.e. to express the interactive controls $\vec{u}(t)$ via the pure controls $\vec{u}^\circ(t)$:

$$\vec{u}(t) = \vec{u}(\vec{u}^\circ(t), \varphi(t), \dot{\varphi}(t); K_\alpha).$$

Let us now substitute the state $\varphi(t)$ and its time derivative $\dot{\varphi}(t)$ by their retarded (delayed) values $\varphi(t - \Delta t)$ and $\dot{\varphi}(t - \Delta t)$. Such approximated feedback may be substituted into the evolution equations:

$$\dot{\varphi}(t) = \Phi(\varphi(t), \vec{u}(\vec{u}^\circ(t), \varphi(t - \Delta t), \dot{\varphi}(t - \Delta t); K_\alpha)).$$

Thus we obtain an ordinary differential game *(with the retarded, delayed arguments)*, which is just the *retarded control approximation* of the initial laced interactive game.

Sometimes the frozen feedback approximation and the retarded control approximation coincide but it is not so in general.

Remark 6. The retarded control approximations form a series of approximation defined by the initial time t_0, such that the states $\varphi(t)$ for the considered laced interactive game at $t < t_0$ are the initial data the approximation. One may describe more subtle effects considering the mutual correlations of the retarded control approximations with variable t_0.

I suspect that the ideological intuition of the nonlinear geometric algebra [5] (see also [6]) may be essential for the analysis of series of the retarded control approximation, for instance a verification of any algebraic correlations between the different retarded control approximations may be important as during analysis of concrete games as for the axiomatic separation of the interesting classes of the laced interactive games or for a classification of various types of interactivity.

Note that the procedure of *virtualization* may be considered not only for the interactive systems [7] but also for the interactive games.

Remark 7. The approximating series of games may be used for a formulation of predictions for processes in the initial interactive game. Such formulation may be analytic, however, it is difficult to perceive and to interpret the obtained results in real time. Thus, it is rather reasonable to use some *visual representation* for the series of the approximating games. Thus, we are constructing an enlargement of the interactive game, in which the players *interactively* observe the visual predictions for a game in real time. Certainly, such enlargement may strongly transform the structure of interactivity of the game (i.e. to change the feedbacks entered into the interactive controls of players). Note that the aim of the virtualization is to restore the past of the interactive processes whereas the goal of the proposed enlargement is to correct their future. In some sense they are two complementary faces of the unique general procedure.

§4 Conclusions

Thus, an important class of differential interactive games, namely, one of the laced interactive games, was considered. *A posteriori* analysis of such games (including the virtual *a posteriori* decomposition of a collective control) was discussed. Approximations of the laced interactive games by the ordinary differential games, the frozen feedback approximation and the retarded control approximation, were constructed.

References

[1] Isaaks R., Differential games. A mathematical theory with applications to warfare and pursuit, control and optimization. Wiley, New York, 1965;
Owen G., Game theory, Saunders, Philadelphia, 1968.

[2] Juriev D., Interactive games and representation theory. I,II. E-prints: math.FA/9803020, math.RT/9808098.

[3] Juriev D., Droems: experimental mathematics, informatics and infinite dimensional geometry. Report RCMPI-96/05$^+$ [e-version: cs.HC/9809119].

[4] Yang Jwing-Ming, The root of Chineese Chi Kung. The secrets of Chi Kung training. YMAA, Boston, 1989.

[5] Sabinin L.V., On the nonlinear geometric algebra [in Russian]. In "Webs and quasigroups". Kalinin [Tver'], 1988, pp.32-37;
Sabinin L.V., Differential geometry and quasigroups [in Russian]. Trans.Inst.Math. Siberian Branch Soviet Acad.Sci., Novosibirsk, 1984, v.14, pp.208-221.

[6] Mikheev P.O., Sabinin L.V., Quasigroups and differential geometry. In "Quasigroups and loops. Theory and applications". Berlin, Heldermann Verlag, 1990, P.357-430.

[7] Juriev D., On the description of physical interactive information systems [in Russian]. Report RCMPI-96/05 (1996) [e-version: mp_arc/96-459].